



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

believe all editors are alike indifferent to the matter. Some forms, like *σῶζω* and *οἱ μέν* (87), now seem a trifle old-fashioned. The publishers for their part could hardly have done more than they have.

J. H. WHEELER.

An Etymology of Latin and Greek. By CHARLES S. HALSEY, A. M. Boston : Ginn, Heath & Co. 1882.

The title-page of this little work should have read somewhat as follows : An Essay by Dr. Maurice Bloomfield, divided into two parts, between which parts are inserted most of the Etymologies given in Curtius' *Griechische Etymologie* (before it was revised for the 5th edition), preceded by the greater part of Dr. Maurice Bloomfield's review of Meyer's *Griechische Grammatik*; besides these, twenty pages of matter extracted from various text-books; *plus* a chapter of one page, a list of roots, and three long indices, the last by Charles S. Halsey, A. M. This we believe to be fairer than the present title. We do not mean to say that the author has surreptitiously borrowed from other authors; but no one who had not seen this Journal for September, 1880, could guess how much lies hidden under the remark, "I have given the statement of those chapters condensed mainly from his (Dr. Bloomfield's) paper on the Greek Ablaut"; and again, "The Preliminary Statement is condensed from his article," etc. What does Mr. Halsey mean by 'mainly,' what by 'condensed'? There is not an idea in these chapters that is not expressed in the very words used by Dr. Bloomfield in the Journal a year ago. 'Mainly' means here 'wholly'; 'condensed' means copied and bisected, with here and there an omission.

We have now to examine the plan of the work. The author intends this book to supply a "felt want," for in the chance etymologies of school lexica "no connected systematic or thorough knowledge of etymology is acquired" (Preface, p. iii). This is very true. Let us now see how the author undertakes to give the young student the first ideas of "systematic" etymology. We must bear in mind that the work is intended for beginners, for such indeed as have "no knowledge of the Greek language" (p. xv). In the first twenty pages the author runs over the main facts of relationship between the I. E. languages. We notice on p. 2 that Armenian is unhesitatingly classed as Eranian, that Sanskrit is regarded as derived from Vedic. Of Pali and dialects which may go back to Vedic, not as derivatives but as parallel growths, no mention is made. Every root is monosyllabic (p. 6). The principle which underlies the greater part of phonetic change is the tendency to ease of utterance (p. 16). These points are merely stated, not discussed, doubtless because in a work "for school use" it is undesirable to present conflicting views (p. xiv). Why then do we have the "principles of the new school" set forth in the language of a scholar, and with such technical form that no schoolboy in America could follow the ideas given for two pages together? Why are twenty pages of general remarks followed by a learned essay on the Greek ablaut which can be of no possible interest to "such as have no knowledge of Greek," to such as those for whom the book is intended? This tacking together of disparate material shows itself in many details. So what Dr. Bloomfield calls *guna* is changed by

Mr. Halsey, sensibly enough for schoolboy use, into 'vowel increase,' and yet comes up without any notice with the incorrect spelling *guna* on p. 23.

The fact is we have no introduction here at all, no system, no arrangement. No scholar would use the book, for the material is either old or mutilated; no schoolboy could use it, for he would be lost in the first two pages of the "views of the new school." Theoretically the author stands as an advocate neither of the new nor of the old school. He presents both with the remark that in general the later views are more likely to prove correct, a simple end of all controversy. Practically the bulk of the book follows the old school, as most of the etymologies are quoted directly in the order in which Curtius has them (gutturals, liquids, sibilants, etc.), in "Regular Substitution," followed by the "Irregular Substitution." These etymologies can hardly be taken from the latest (5th, 1879) edition, for although that edition is mentioned (by Dr. Bloomfield, p. 21), we cannot conceive how this list can have been made with the 5th edition before the author, unless he voluntarily intended to bring up the ancient sins of the old school and chose to forget the recantation. For if Curtius is the exponent of the old school, are we to understand that Mr. Halsey is unwilling to admit recent investigations, or makes the old school still responsible for connecting No. 159 (*herus*) *erus* with *χελρ*? Curtius in the 5th edition says this *erus* on account of fem. *esa* is to be dismissed, thus recanting his former views. By what right too is (No. 27) Sk. *kalamas* connected with *κάλαμος*? This is a derivation repudiated in 5th edition "on account of the Slavic form." Why in explaining the views of the old school should *mav* and *mu* (Nos. 379, 380) still remain under separate heads (*ἀμείβω moveo*, but *ἀμύνω munio*) when Curtius in his 5th edition takes especial pains to unite the groups, referring moreover *murus* (which Mr. Halsey refers to root *mu*) to *mi*, build? If Fick or others support the rejected derivation, should it not be noted by an author who quotes Curtius as the especial master of the old school and is content to show us his results without explaining his methods?

A word is to be said as to the arrangement of this etymology. Though cognate languages are generally omitted, yet the forms are sometimes admitted; but one is at a loss to know on what principle this is done. Why is *çatam* brought forward in No. 15 and *viçati* omitted in No. 13; and in No. 17 why is *çvaçura* given (and spelled *çvacura* !) while in No. 44 the Sanskrit form that so well illustrates *civis* is entirely omitted, although no explanation is given of the mental process by which *civis* is developed out of the idea of 'lie' or 'keep quiet'?

This brings us to another great defect in this manual—the almost entire absence of that help which a student studying etymology most needs—help in aiding him to understand the process by which the idea is evolved. Once in a while this is done, as in *carina* (No. 42), *credo* (No. 256), *flamen* (No. 140), but in general the student is left to his own resources. For instance, in the first derivation given we have the root *ak- ank- anc-*; under this are placed, pell-mell, "*ancilla*, a maid-servant," "*angulus*, a corner," "*uncus*, a hook." What idea does the schoolboy receive from this as to the connection between 'maid,' 'corner' and 'hook'? *Civis* (No. 44) we have already mentioned: would it not aid "a systematic etymology" to mention the Oscan *kevis* and to have said that the root was, at best, only a guess? Should we not be told (No. 60) what connection exists between *causa* and *cura*: are 'cause' and 'care' related ideas in

the mind of the schoolboy? Should not at least an explanation accompany the doubtful statement that while *abdo*, to put away, and *condo* put together (No. 256), contain root *dha*, to place or make, *perdo*, meaning to put through (No. 225) comes from a different root? And again, why is *famulus* a slave? Would it not be well to have noted the fact that the Oscan *fama* means 'a house,' and *famulus* does not come directly from the root *dha*, to make, but means 'he who belongs to the house'? Even Curtius, who writes for scholars and not for schoolboys, notes that he connects *avus* with *av* from the supposed pleasant and tender relationship between the old man and his children; but here we have this *avus* alongside of *obediens* on the one side and *aveo* on the other, without explanation of the mental process which produced the word.

There are many etymologies stated as certain which are certainly not so. There are others which are really no derivation at all; for instance, "No. 26, Greek root *κακ*, *κακός*, *bad*." Where is the derivation? In No. 32 we have some remarkable Sanskrit. To explain *κανάσω* and *cano* the root *kan* is assumed in Sk. (*i. e.* *kan*), and with this is given Sk. "*kankañi* (sic), bell." Now changing this to *kāñkañi*, as it should be written, we still have no word for *bell*, but a word for a *ring* which had bells on it; moreover, the original masc. form *kañkaṇa* contains in classical Sk. no idea of sound, but that of rotundity. The other fem. *kīñkīñi* means a bell.

In No. 30 A. S. *hal*, German and Gothic forms are given. Why here and in so few such examples? To the Latin words as they stand in Curtius have been added a mass of English words derivable from them. It is here that the schoolboy at length has something worthy of him. Here he can learn that from *tendo* come *tension*, *tent*, *attend*, *contend*, *distend* and all the other *tends*, full lists of which are given. Every Latin root is carried out in all its ramifications in English. This is the other end of the scale—the schoolboy has his turn.

Had this work been done well it would have supplied a "felt want" indeed. Our disappointment as we close it makes us feel the want more deeply than before. We still want a simple introduction that shall teach youth how to see connection of ideas, shall give him firm ground to go upon, shall lay down the laws of philology in simple language fitted to his understanding. This book does not answer such a purpose. Dr. Bloomfield's learned article was admirable where it first appeared, but it was never meant to teach the theories of the new school to those who do not know Greek or who have not already studied the subject. The new school is explained, but too profoundly; the old school is illustrated, but not *explained* at all.

E. W. H.

---

Papers of the Archaeological Institute of America. Classical Series, I. Report on the investigations at Assos, 1881, by JOSEPH THACHER CLARKE, with an Appendix<sup>1</sup> containing Inscriptions from Assos and Lesbos, and papers, by W. C. LAWTON and J. S. DILLER. Printed at the cost of the Harvard Art Club and the Harvard Philological Society. Boston: Published by A. Williams & Co. London: N. Trübner & Co. 1882.

Mr. Clarke's report to the Archaeological Institute of America on the investigations at Assos, made in 1881, has been before that society for some months.

<sup>1</sup> Lack of space prevents a discussion of the Appendix.